

## Stakeholder Process Situation Assessment: Utah Lake Water Quality Study

### I. Overview and Introduction

In November 2017, RESOLVE and SWCA were hired to facilitate the Utah Lake Water Quality Study (ULWQS) Steering Committee (SC) process. RESOLVE is a neutral, private, non-profit group that provides process support to people addressing complex environmental and public policy issues. SWCA provides comprehensive environmental planning, regulatory compliance, and water resources management services to local governments and businesses across the United States. One of our initial tasks was to conduct a situation assessment to quickly and efficiently build our understanding of the stakeholder dynamics and substantive issues being explored in the process. The situation assessment goal is to provide the stakeholders with thoughts on how to construct a solid foundation for a collaborative process to achieve consensus-based solutions.

All primary SC members were interviewed during December 2017 and January 2018, mostly in-person with two by phone. In some cases, the alternate SC members were present and contributed responses in collaboration with the primary representative. The interviews were conducted by Professional Facilitator Paul De Morgan and either Water Quality Specialist Dave Epstein or Public Engagement Lead Brian Nicholson. The interviews were guided by a list of questions provided in Appendix A. Each interview lasted approximately one hour and interviews were documented with detailed notes that were archived into the project file. Notes from all of the interviews were synthesized into this report. In developing the report, and in particular the recommendations below, we also drew upon the discussions at the first two SC meetings (January 4, 2018 and January 23, 2018)

Often the goal of a situation assessment is to assess the potential for initiating a collaborative, consensus-based process to address the identified issues and to recommend a process design if appropriate. In this case, the process was already underway and so our focus was on how best to build on the existing framework in order to assist the group in achieving its objectives. We used the situation assessment to ascertain procedural and substantive goals for the effort and identify challenges to and opportunities for moving the ULWQS process forward. In addition, given the focus on science we explored the SC members' perspectives on science and the role it would play in the process. Finally, we also examined perspectives on public involvement and what constitutes good public engagement as the SC is only part of the engagement process associated with the Study.

The situation assessment results will provide the steering committee members and the facilitator with an improved understanding of the stakeholder dynamics and set the stage for a thoughtful approach to facilitation of stakeholder meetings and coordination with other committees and the project sponsors. In addition, the interviews themselves initiated the ULWQS SC process component by providing interviewees with an opportunity to begin reflecting on the important contextual issues of the study. While not all of the content of the interviews was incorporated into this report, the most important themes that arose during interviews that are particularly relevant to the SCs ability to work together were summarized and are discussed in this Assessment Report.

RESOLVE and SWCA would like to express their appreciation to all the interviewees who gave willingly of their time to share information and ideas and without whom this report would not be possible.

## II. Background

The Utah Division of Water Quality (DWQ) and Utah Lake Commission (ULC) initiated a water quality study on Utah Lake in November 2015 to evaluate the role of excess nutrients on the support of designated beneficial uses in the lake. Utah Lake is designated for the following beneficial use classes: 2B (infrequent primary contact recreation), 3B (warm water fishery/aquatic life), 3D (waterfowl, shore birds and associated aquatic life) and 4 (agricultural uses), but was listed in DWQ's 2016 Integrated Report lists as impaired (not supporting the beneficial use) for all of its beneficial uses (except 3D).

The impairments are based on numerous water quality parameters including PCBs in fish tissue, nutrients, and harmful algal blooms. Phase 1 of the study focused on compilation and synthesis of existing water quality and related scientific information. Phase 2 of the study will develop any necessary in-lake water quality criteria to protect Utah Lake's designated recreational, aquatic life, and agricultural uses. In order to ensure a collaborative process with engaged stakeholders to guide scientific analyses and regulatory decision making, DWQ developed an approach to include the stakeholders in the process.

The new process establishes a SC made up of local municipalities, interest groups, university researchers, water managers, water users, and state, local and federal agencies and charged with gaining broad acceptance of the process and outcomes through a consensus based, transparent, and scientifically defensible approach. In addition, a Science Panel (SP), is envisioned to assist the SC in achieving its goals. DWQ developed a charter document (*Utah Lake Water Quality Study Stakeholder Process*) describing the approach, objectives, roles and responsibilities, procedures and potential outcomes of the stakeholder process. The process document will guide the development of water quality criteria and all SC and SP meetings will be facilitated by the RESOLVE/SWCA project team. The stakeholder process for the ULWQS was developed recognizing that members of the SC represent a diverse range of backgrounds and potentially divergent positions.

## III. Interests Represented (on the Steering Committee)

Each of the interests involved in Phase I were asked to submit nominations for the ULWQS SC seats. In almost all cases, the interests identified one nominee and those individuals were approved by DWQ and the ULC to represent the interests of a group of stakeholders. When multiple nominees were proposed, DWQ and ULC chose from among those proposed individuals. Conversations during the interviews highlighted some of the common interests and clarified that these "interests" actually represent desired outcomes for the ULWQS. These common interests are listed below:

- Protect overall water quality
- Manage water quality for wildlife (including listed species such as the June Sucker)
- Manage water quality for "consumptive uses" including irrigation and livestock
- Manage water quality for recreational and aesthetic uses
- Ensure potential costs to ratepayers are justified
- Ensure human health is not at risk
- Ensure water quality for downstream (senior) water users

We explored the question of whether additional interests needed to be included in the SC at this point, however no broad interest categories were identified. As a related aside, during the first meeting public

comment a specific stakeholder group indicated they were unclear of the way in which they were represented (and as such would like to be on the SC). Subsequent discussion reaffirmed the overall SC approach of having the broad interest category representatives serve as an avenue for specific groups to have input into the SC deliberations, while also noting that additional public engagement opportunities will be available moving forward.

#### **IV. Goals for the Stakeholder Process**

The overall goal of the Steering Committee, as described in the Charter, is to guide water quality criteria development and recommend in-lake water quality criteria, which are protective of designated uses and sustain the natural resources of Utah Lake, to the Utah Lake Commission and the Utah Water Quality Board. In the course of our interviews we explored the Steering Committee members' opinions of the goals of the process from their perspectives. The responses, while generally indicating awareness of the Charter's goal, were unsurprisingly broader than the goal defined by the Charter and can be divided into procedural and substantive ones. It should be noted that some stakeholders were not aware, or at least were not fully aware of, the primary goal.

##### ***Proposed Procedural Goals***

- The development of a standard should be collaborative, based on science, justifiable and economically feasible
- Involve the steering committee and get "buy-in" to the whole process and its goal
  - The process is important
  - Establish trust among stakeholders/steering committee members
- Use initial meetings to establish credibility of the effort
- Employ a bottom-up decision-making process
- Engage the public to understand what they want for Utah Lake
- Work together and maintain respect for other steering committee members and the process
- Determine if this process is a "want" or a "need"
- Create opportunities to build common understanding

##### ***Proposed Substantive Goals***

- Identify a number (standard/criteria) that is attainable (feasible)
- Improve the condition of Utah Lake
  - Improve water quality
    - Reduce nutrients
  - Achieve as "clean as possible" for recreational use
  - Control invasive species
- Shift from a situation where DWQ is viewed as the "bad guy" for its efforts
- Avoid outcome where certain stakeholders are viewed as "the" problem
- Produce clear answers so there is distinct direction for how to convert the lake into one that sustains its beneficial uses
- Make sure the product of the process is understandable by the public (and the public can ideally support the solutions)
- Identify a threshold condition where HABs will not occur
- Establish a common agenda for and an approach to research (e.g., DWQ and Wasatch Front Water Quality Council (WFWQC))
- Synthesize existing information and get everyone on the same page

- Understand how Utah Lake works
- Answer outstanding scientific questions of the SC including:
  - What is the effect of carp removal on HABs/nutrient cycling?
  - Would reducing nutrient loading (e.g., through POTW upgrades and nonpoint source reduction) make a difference?
  - What can be attributed to atmospheric deposition?
    - Obtain estimates of dry and wet atmospheric nutrient deposition
  - What is the nutrient loading from internal vs. external sources?
  - Can agricultural water delivered from Utah Lake during HABs be used for irrigation and livestock watering?

## V. Key Issues

In the course of the interviews, participants identified both challenges to and opportunities for moving the ULWQS process forward. The challenges provide the Steering Committee and the facilitation team with a suite of issues to make sure they are tracking throughout the process and striving to address. The opportunities serve as ideas for helping to address those challenges and ensure a stronger overall process. The recommendations in the Summary and Recommendations section build on the ideas raised by the stakeholders.

### ***Challenges to Moving Forward (i.e., areas of disagreement/concern)***

- Different perspectives on credibility of data/studies and different data sources
- Significant stakeholder frustration regarding the existing process by which HABs are classified and publicized
- The need to balance the urgency to develop a solution (i.e., establish a lake-specific standard) with taking the necessary time to “do it right”
- Concern from some stakeholders that DWQ, and possibly others, has already singled-out particular parties as responsible
- The potential that some will focus on “assigning blame” for water quality degradation as a way to move forward
- Ensuring objectivity of the science panel and that all stakeholders have faith in the science panel
- Ensuring solutions for Utah Lake “make sense” economically
  - Achieving goals in a cost-effective manner
  - The numeric standard must be attainable
- Need for some stakeholders of a guarantee that mandated action will result in positive changes to the lake
- The lake ecology, as it is better understood, may limit the uses and potential solutions

### ***Opportunities for Moving Forward***

- Create an environment where all stakeholders can get on the same page
- Develop consensus around the table during the process to move forward and join forces to solve problems together in the future
- Encourage stakeholders to buy into the process and initiate efforts to work together
  - Agree upon research methods
- Use science to guide the next steps
- Build common understanding of what Utah Lake is, what it historically was, and what it is not
- Synthesize existing data/information

- Agree on a process for lake closures due to HABs
  - Is there an agreed-upon concentration of cyanobacteria that poses a serious risk to humans?
  - Avoid disconnects between DWQ, the County Health Department, other stakeholders, and the public
- Develop a standardized way to communicate to the media and have all stakeholders agree on what goes to the media

## VI. Science

### ***The Role of Science (Procedural)***

A common theme emerging during SC interviews was the importance of science in achieving the goals of the ULWQS. There was a general sentiment that the science will guide the direction of the study and will reveal a solution. A majority of SC members mentioned the need for “good science” in the process. While there may be differing perspectives on what “good science” actually is, the SC seems to agree that an investment of time and resources into understanding the existing and future scientific studies of the Utah Lake ecosystem is paramount. One specific suggestion of what “good science” was that it should come from outside sources beyond the control of the DWQ, to remove the agency from the studies. Another component of “good science” as defined by the SC during these interviews is that it would be authored by unbiased investigators and free from politics and other influences. While this widespread desire to remove bias from the process is understandable, we suggest that the term “objective” is more appropriate, as one could argue that everyone has biases and even researchers can be biased. “Objective” seems to be a good description for “good science” in that the approach to the research is open-minded and the investigator is open to whatever results are elucidated by the research. In general, all research studies and scientific data should be received objectively and with an open mind.

For some, another role for science in the ULWQS process is to bridge the gap between the DWQ and the Wasatch Front Water Quality Council (WFWQC). The two groups seem to have some similar goals and both have funding for research, therefore it would be beneficial to establish a common research agenda and pool resources together. Finally, a major role for science in the process would be to provide credibility to the ULWQS and the Utah Lake-specific numeric criteria developed during the study. Essentially, if the ULWQS is guided by “good science,” the outcome will warrant respect, credibility and approval from the public. Numerous SC members expressed the need for science to provide assurance that changes within the Utah Lake watershed due to the outcome of the study will result in positive changes to Utah Lake. While it is not possible for the science to provide a guarantee as some SC members alluded to, the role of science in the process is to provide a certain level of confidence that the outcome of the ULWQS will result in positive changes to Utah Lake.

### ***What Science is Needed?***

As described above, the sentiment that ‘science is critical to the success of the ULWQS’ was expressed unanimously among SC members. However, within the SC there are a diversity of opinions on **what** science is actually needed to achieve the goals of the study. A common sentiment described during interviews with the SC was that “good science,” guided by the SP, would lead to a successful project. However, some SC members offered ideas about specific information or studies that should be pursued. Numerous individuals suggested that misconceptions may exist around what Utah Lake historically was (before the influence of modern humans), what it currently is, and what it could become. Therefore, within the SC there is a shared interest in scientific information that would describe the Utah Lake

ecosystem, its historic condition, and the type of ecosystem it can and cannot become with future changes to the watershed. Along these lines, one SC member suggested that once a modeled depiction of the lake ecosystem has been developed, a sensitivity analysis should be completed to determine which parameters have the greatest effect on water quality. This exercise would help the SC (and SP) to prioritize which parameters to focus on in further scientific studies. It should be noted that there is a team from the University of Utah developing a model of the Utah Lake ecosystem, which undoubtedly includes a similar sensitivity analysis and may be a source of information for the ULWQS process.

Other ideas for additional science were presented during interviews with the SC. One suggestion was to develop a nutrient budget for the lake, which would include quantifying the mass of the nutrient of interest (phosphorus) present within the lake, the mass that enters the lake via point and non-point sources (including springs under the lake), in addition to atmospheric deposition. A distinction would be made between natural and human-caused sources of nutrients to the overall budget. Ultimately, the SC will rely on science to identify numeric criteria for nutrients, which would be identified to transform Utah Lake into the desired condition identified by the SC.

### ***Science Panel Role and Membership***

During interviews, the majority of SC members stressed the importance of the SP to the success of the ULWQS. The SP process is laid out in the Charter document and can be described as follows. The SP will synthesize existing scientific information specific to Utah Lake and help the SC to identify and appropriately frame key questions that need to be answered by further scientific study. Once a list of key questions is developed, the SP will develop these into scientific studies. The SP will hire and oversee third parties to perform these scientific studies, and then synthesize the results of the studies for presentation to the SC. While the SP can help the SC pursue answers to scientific questions, the SP also needs to advise the SC when they know “enough” to identify nutrient criteria, and further studies need not be pursued. During the final stages of the ULWQS, the SC will rely on the SP to provide their expert opinions on any numeric criteria developed for Utah Lake which would serve as a vote of confidence that such a standard is realistic and feasible.

In general, SC members view the SP as a group of experts who, at the disposal of the SC, can help interpret scientific information and translate technical information into layman’s terms. As mentioned in the “Role of Science” section above, SC members stressed that SP members should be objective scientists and should approach Utah Lake data accordingly. In addition, the group thought the SP should include a range of seasoned researchers with diverse experiences.

## **VII. Public Engagement**

RESOLVE and SWCA have also been tasked with developing a white paper on public engagement opportunities for the ULWQS and, as part of that effort, the Situation Assessment included questions to begin to understand the SC members’ perspectives on who to engage and ideas on the best way to engage constituents. Overall, there is a sense that the public has not been sufficiently informed regarding water quality issues. For this effort to ultimately be successful (in particular from an implementation perspective) the stakeholders believe public engagement needs to include opportunities for increasing the public’s understanding about the water quality issues generally, identifying their issues, concerns, and interests, and ensuring the ULWQS process and outcomes are shared for feedback, in an on-going fashion.

### ***Who Else Should be Engaged Through the Public Engagement Process?***

- The Utah Lake “users” or those who actually use the lake (recreationists)
- The youth, who should be engaged with school curriculum
- Mayors and city council members who can disseminate information to their constituents
- The residents/ratepayers (aka “the public”)
- Legislators
- Conservation district board members

### ***What is the Best Way to Engage Constituents?***

- Have events in venues that are easy for the public to discover
- Conduct public engagement early in the process
- Make messaging digestible and easy to find and understand
  - Language should be for the layperson to understand with links to access (additional) technical information
- Maintain transparency
- Need a standardized way to communicate to the media and have all stakeholders agree on what goes to the media
  - Utilize the Steering Committee members’ (as individuals and through their resources)
  - Send out consistent messaging from all groups
- Education is an essential component
  - Educational programs in local schools
- Encourage multiple/all stakeholders to utilize a variety of channels:
  - Social media
  - Press releases
  - Open houses
    - Public meetings, professional meetings
- Tell stories, convey the benefits (economic) of a revived Utah Lake
- Engage entities directly linked to the Lake such as homeowners’ associations and the Utah Lake marinas

## **VIII. Summary and Recommendations**

### ***Characteristics of Successful Collaboration***

In assessing how to set the stage for a successful collaborative effort it is useful to consider whether a set of elements or characteristics, likely to make collaboration productive and successful, are present. Below we identify those *characteristics*, describe them briefly, and provide our sense of how they are addressed within the current ULWQS effort.

- *Clear Objectives* – parties agree on the overall objectives for the collaborative process

Assessment: The ULWQS process has a clear goal that many parties understand, though not all parties have as strong an understanding of the goal as the conveners. Further, to achieve the overall goal, additional objectives will have to be better defined and addressed. Initial efforts of the ULWQS SC will benefit from a coordinated approach to establish a common understanding of the goals and related objectives.

- *Manageable Issues* – parties agree on a manageable number of interdependent or related issues, and a sufficiently well-developed fact basis exists on which to hold a meaningful discussion and resolution of the issues.

Assessment: At this point there is an extensive list of related issues and while a more concrete set of defined ones would be beneficial, inherently the ULWQS process is designed to assist the stakeholders in defining the key issues and addressing them with the assistance of a robust research approach. Accordingly, the Science Panel process envisioned is designed as a “joint fact finding” effort that will position the SC members to engage in meaningful deliberations.

- *Identifiable Representative Parties* – parties interested in or affected by the outcome of the collaboration are readily identifiable, capable of identifying from among themselves participants that can adequately represent all affected interests, and few enough in number to allow for a manageable process. Participants are able to represent and reflect the interests of their constituencies.

Assessment: The efforts of Phase I to convene the SC were comprehensive and resulted in a broad set of stakeholders effectively positioned to reflect the interests of their constituencies. While ensuring a manageable process resulted in a situation where every stakeholder group was not directly represented on the SC, the appropriate range of interests appears to be covered. Ensuring the wide range of stakeholders are engaged, through the SC process and the broader public engagement process, will be important to building and maintaining a strong foundation of support for the effort and ultimately the outcomes.

- *Good Faith Participation* – parties can come to the table with genuine interest in participating in good faith. They feel themselves as likely, if not more likely, to achieve their overall goals using a collaborative approach as they would through whatever alternatives are available to them.

Assessment: While concerns about the overall ability of the group to achieve its goals, in part driven by some of the expected uncertainty about the underlying facts, throughout the interviews the full range of stakeholders indicated their support for and commitment to the process.

- *Adequate Resources and Time* – parties can obtain adequate resources to participate, including technical support, and there is adequate time to conduct a meaningful and well-designed process.

Assessment: The ULWQS process benefits from an existing set of resources, in terms of staff support and research funding, that will provide the group with the ability to identify and answer questions needed to set the stage for robust deliberations. Additional resources or leveraging other resources would likely be useful to ensure the full range of issues are adequately addressed.

- *Action-Forcing Opportunity* – there is some sort of legislative, administrative, or judicial opportunity requiring a decision within the foreseeable future.

Assessment: The DWQ and Utah Lake Commission developed the ULWQS process with an allocation of funding from the Utah Water Quality Board to specifically address a set of



circumstances being driven by uncertainty related to Utah Lake water quality and the need for stakeholders to play a role in addressing that uncertainty.

- *Implementation Mechanism* – a mechanism exists to implement a consensus agreement if one is reached.

Assessment: There is a clear process for the recommendations, if developed, to be considered and implemented.

### **Recommendations:**

Our sense, after the interviews and assessing the process against these elements, is that the overall foundation for the ULWQS process is strong, building on the work of Phase I and in particular the Charter document. Notwithstanding this assessment, we believe there are some additional recommendations the ULWQS SC should consider implementing as they initiate their efforts.

### Steering Committee Process:

1. *Use initial meetings to set the process foundation, substantive foundation, and establish the SP* – while the SC will understandably be interested in quickly defining a vision and identifying the range of unknowns for research, ensuring that the strong foundation in place is solidified and the process envisioned is effectively set in motion will provide a greater likelihood of long-term success and achievement of the overall goals. The anticipated length of the process and the number of uncertainties that will require time to address allow for the group to “go slow to go fast” by establishing a process all SC members can support.
2. *Establish an agreed-upon set of Operating Principles* – while the Charter lays out a number of process elements, providing an opportunity for the SC to mutually develop an explicit and resilient set of operating principles will help ensure a long-term viable process. The process should provide for assurances that all parties will abide by agreed-upon principles and that parties will not attempt unilateral efforts to sabotage or undermine the process as it proceeds or the agreement once it is reached.
3. *After setting a foundation, hone in on key questions and study development efforts* – building on the initial efforts, it is clear that the SC will benefit from working closely with the SP to clearly define questions requiring scientific research to position themselves to be able to develop solutions and recommendations.
4. *Create an adaptive culture related to process and implementation* – generally, and amplified by the anticipated length of the process (between three and five years), ensuring the SC establishes a strong collaborative approach early while recognizing that they as a group can and should adapt the process as they learn more will be a valuable ‘ethic’ to encourage.
5. *Accordingly, build in regular process checks* – the Co-Chairs, facilitation team, and SC members will all benefit from revisiting the process at regular intervals throughout the process. As the entities defining the meeting agendas, the Co-Chairs and facilitation team should make sure to provide opportunities for the full group to share their thoughts on how the process is unfolding and explore modifications as appropriate.

6. *Provide for a process to understand implications (benefits and problems) of issues and ensure potential unintended consequences are explored* – in the course of defining and answering questions and then exploring the implications of those findings, the full SC should examine the issues from all angles. In setting the stage for the SC deliberations, the Co-Chairs and facilitation team should incorporate time for such efforts. These efforts will not only assist the SC in its efforts to develop a recommendation, but also in setting the stage for an implementable solution if efforts proceed.
7. *Ensure interest-based constituencies are engaged through the ULWQS effort* – SC members, chosen through a nominations process in Phase I, are expected to represent the individuals and groups within their “stakeholder interest category;” and as such, communicating with these constituencies will be important to ensuring a successful ULWQS outcome. Each SC member should have a clear approach to engaging their constituencies throughout the process (e.g., sharing contact information, encouraging information exchange at appropriate times in the process). Relatedly, in developing the public engagement approach, DWQ and the SC should give specific thought to the different needs for ‘constituencies’ and the public (thought there will undoubtedly be overlap).
8. *Including a diversity of interests, and utilizing an interest-based approach to deliberations, provides a strong foundation for balanced, implementable solutions* – while a specific action is not recommended, we strongly feel that the broad inclusion of interests in the ULWQS process, when combined with an interest-based approach to negotiations where SC members strive to ensure their interests as well as the interests of other members are met, will best position the group to develop agreements the group can support and that can be implemented.

#### Science Panel

9. *Convene a SP that includes both specific expertise and broad specialists who can collectively think about the “big-picture” science process and effectively manage the implementation efforts* – the SP will be an integral component of the ULWQS process and the ability of the SC to work with SP in defining questions, answering questions, and developing recommendations will be of paramount importance. The SP tasks are significant and wide-ranging and having a broad cross-section of thinkers will likely increase their ability to successfully engage with the SC.
10. *Identify ‘objective’ SP members who are open-minded and willing to consider whatever results are elucidated by the research* – while SP members may have their own biases with respect to the subject areas in which they are experts, it is critical for the SP to be objective in approaching scientific questions, data, and recommendations related to the ULWQS. A panel of objective scientists will be a significant asset to the SC and the ULWQS.
11. *Explore opportunities to work with and leverage other research and modeling efforts related to the Utah Lake water quality issues* – other entities, including WFWQC and the University of Utah, are engaged in on-going efforts that have the potential to add value to and enhance the ULWQS overall endeavors. While integrating other scientific efforts into the ULWQS will likely require coordination, the potential benefits are worth exploring to ensure resources are used as efficiently and effectively as possible.

## Public Engagement

While another task of RESOLVE and SWCA is to develop a white paper on public engagement opportunities for the ULWQS, a few initial ideas emerged from the interviews. Specific recommendations to consider include:

12. *Build a public engagement plan in coordination with the SC* – building on the white paper to be developed, DWQ will be defining a plan to engage the public in the ULWQS process and the SC should be intimately involved in those efforts to ensure the range of constituents are considered.
13. *Utilize SC members, to extent they are willing, in public engagement efforts* – the SC members are at the table to represent a broad set of interests and relatedly are as well positioned as anyone to represent the ULWQS efforts to those interests. Some SC members already have processes and/or channels to communicate with the public and these should be utilized to the extent possible. Involvement in public engagement efforts would likely require additional time commitment from the SC members and so an efficient and well-defined public engagement plan is essential.
14. *Include opportunities to increase the public's understanding about the water quality issues generally, identifying their issues, concerns, and interests, and ensuring the ULWQS process and outcomes are shared for feedback, in an on-going fashion* – increasing awareness and understanding of water quality issues will help build an informed public. Those initial efforts will then set the stage for opportunities to actively engage the public in identification of issues and to provide feedback on SC efforts throughout the process.

In closing, these recommendations will be most useful if the SC ensures steps are taken to implement them and, as importantly, track their implementation over time. If the SC, after reviewing this Stakeholder Process Situation Assessment, determines any of the recommendations (as written or modified) would be helpful to their achieving their goals, the SC should task the Co-Chairs and facilitation team with regularly updating the group on their efforts to implement the recommendations and, as appropriate, providing opportunities for the SC members to share updates on their efforts.